

secondary sources, which makes further research easier for those interested. The specialist will appreciate the publication and synthesis of recent data within his/her respective region.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

CHRISTOPHER R. CHADWICK

Hiestand, Gerald and Todd Wilson. *The Pastor Theologian: Resurrecting an Ancient Vision*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2015. 188 pp. Paperback, \$18.99.

Todd Wilson and Gerald Hiestand, senior pastor and senior associate pastor of Calvary Memorial Church (Oak Park, Illinois), cofounded the Center for Pastor Theologians (CPT) in 2006 with Hiestand as executive director. The CPT's mission is to assist pastors "in the study and written production of biblical and theological scholarship, for the ecclesial renewal of theology and the theological renewal of the church" (10).

Their book is an extended appeal to pastors to pursue a life ministry of intellectual rigor and theological study and thus provide essential ecclesial and theological leadership to the contemporary church. They define ecclesial theology as "theology that is germinated within the congregation, that presses toward distinctly ecclesial concerns, and that is cultivated by practicing clergy" (18), and they contend that this role of "ecclesial theologian" has been in fact the historically normative role for the pastor (for example Irenaeus, Athanasius, Augustine, Calvin, and Jonathan Edwards). The authors, however, bemoan the long-ago vacating of that role in favor of the more pedestrian "intellectual middle management" pastoral role in the faith community today.

Thus, Hiestand and Wilson assert, the church must confront the "bifurcation of the theologian and the pastor" in order to heal the "theological anemia of the church and the ecclesial anemia of theology" (79). They maintain such healing will come when the neglected paradigm of *ecclesial* theologian (in distinction to the pastor as *local* theologian and *popular* theologian) is restored in the pastorate. "The native home of theology is the church, and the responsibility of the church's theological leadership lies with the pastoral community" (77). To bolster their conclusion, the authors include a comprehensive appendix, replete with a 35-page chart, chronicling the shift of theological study and writing from the pastorate to the academy (from Clement of Rome [1st century] to William Nichols [d. 1712]). The book is moderately footnoted, particularly in the historical overview that covers the span of theologians (clerical [i.e., pastoral], nonclerical, and monastic) from the Apostolic Fathers to the post-Enlightenment church.

In building their argument, Hiestand and Wilson offer two caveats. First is their recognition that *academic* theology, "theology developed and sustained within an academic social location and driven by academic questions and concerns" (69), is essential to the life of the Body of Christ. They maintain, however, that it was *because* the church ceased to provide a receptive environment for clergy to pursue theology in the local church that the siphoning of "the best and brightest minds away from the pastorate to

the academy” (77) eventually resulted in the tacit divorce between theologian and pastor that exists today.

Hiestand and Wilson’s second caveat is their recognition that not every pastor is burdened for nor has the proclivity to pursue serious theological reading, study, and writing. (For the authors such reading and study includes the works of Irenaeus, Athanasius, Augustine, Thomas, Calvin, and Luther, along with more contemporary theological luminaries.) The authors assure their readers one can effectively, faithfully shepherd the flock of God without engaging in theological scholarship. But for those pastors “who have unique theological interests and gifting” (80), this book seeks to encourage them to find in the local church a conducive environment for reading, studying, and writing more deeply. Unless such pastors find a supportive faith community for theological study, the syphoning of bright minds from the parish to the academy will continue unabated.

While the book speaks to all who pastor, it clearly targets those who have a penchant for and desire to maintain the continuing discipline of personal study—not simply for the sake of sermon preparation, but also for the personal satisfaction of intellectual and spiritual growth.

As one who has spent his life and ministry serving the faith community through the local pastorate, I believe the authors succeeded in their mission to stir up in the reader’s mind a renewed desire to plumb the depths of theological reflection and study, whether through a periodic reading of systematic theologies, or more essentially through a deepening quest to daily connect with the Spirit of God and theology who inspired Holy Scripture.

I was particularly motivated by Hiestand and Wilson’s eight strategies “on being an ecclesial theologian in a local church” (chapter 8): (1) get a PhD (preferably through a non-residency research program); (2) build a pastoral staff that supports a “robust theological culture in your church” (107); (3) get networked with other pastors sharing a desire for deepening study; (4) guard your study time with a blowtorch; (5) read ecclesial theology; (6) refer to the place where you work as “your study”; (7) build study-and-writing leave into your schedule; and, (8) recruit a pastor-theologian intern. The book unpacks each of these strategies with valuable, practical how-to counsel.

Do you have to be an ecclesial theologian to benefit from their recommended strategies? Clearly not. I was asked to review *The Pastor Theologian* while preparing a lecture for a convention of Seventh-day Adventist North American pastors. My assigned topic was the intellectual growth of the pastor. Hiestand and Wilson’s persuasive case for a deepening study life in the pastorate became grist for my plenary lecture. This book will benefit all who read it, whether or not they are or will become ecclesial theologians. The authors have effectively made their case for deepening theological study among pastors.

But let me challenge two of their contentions. First is their call for a new generation of ecclesial theologians in the church. In order to define such theologians, the authors separate pastoral theologians into four categories: local theologian, popular theologian, academic theologian, and ecclesial

theologian. But such differentiation seems to mitigate against the authors' own appeal: "Insofar as pastors bear the day-to-day burden of teaching and leading God's people, they simply *are* the theological leaders of the church" (57, emphasis theirs). Here they speak of pastors generically. But to then declare that the need of the church is for specialist pastors who (through advanced degrees, extended weekly study, and disseminated theological writing) can guide the wider church theologically belies their original premise that local pastors bear "the day-to-day burden of teaching and leading God's people" and are thus the "theological leaders of the church."

So who is it that most effectively serves the faith community? The local theologian (the pastor who faithfully interprets Holy Scripture to the congregants week after week), the popular theologian (the pastor whose sermons and writings extend beyond the local parish), the academic theologian (the pastor who studies, teaches, and writes from the confines of a seminary) or the ecclesial theologian (the pastor who pursues theology as a life specialty in the local parish and who then writes theology for the academy as well as the church)? Clearly all four categories are called by God to minister to the people of God by "doing theology" for the church of God.

Because I concur with their "local pastors are the theological leaders of the church" premise, it is my sense that Hiestand and Wilson needlessly overstate their case for an increase in the ministry of ecclesial theologians. I can support their call for more parish-based ecclesial theologians in our faith community. But it is my conviction that the theological leadership the authors describe will continue to emanate from the local church even in the absence or scarcity of ecclesial theologians.

My second critique is more incidental. The authors' strong recommendation that pastors earn an advanced academic degree (PhD) in seeking to become ecclesial theologians is a worthy goal. But given the time investment, the older the pastor the less likely an advanced academic degree becomes. Given the financial investment, the younger the pastor the less likely it is for him to have the ability to fund such a degree. While the authors recommend non-residency doctorates (as offered in the United Kingdom) to accommodate full-time parish ministry, the reality is that few pastors will have the luxury of pursuing even a UK doctorate. Furthermore, there have been influential pastors and/or theologians without advanced academic degrees (Karl Barth, F. F. Bruce, Reinhold Niebuhr, et al) who have made significant theological contributions to Christian thought and church belief and practice. Perhaps then, Hiestand and Wilson's call for an academic doctoral degree might better be embraced as a call for disciplined, focused, and guided theological study. There are many seminary theologians who have demonstrated a cheerful willingness to share their bibliographies, reading lists, and proscribed study plans with a needy, inquiring local pastor.

The Pastor Theologian: Resurrecting an Ancient Vision offers a personally inspiring and professionally valuable appeal to pastors in all stages of life and ministry. Its call to pursue a life of intellectual growth and theological depth is one our profession needs to hear frequently. And its recommendation of

practical pastoral practices elaborated in chapter eight is worth the price of the book. The authors quote Kevin Vanhoozer: “The church is less the cradle of Christian theology than its crucible: the place where the community’s understanding of faith is lived, tested, and reformed” (89). It is for that reason that many of us remain pastors in our faith community, and why all of us might benefit from this book.

Pioneer Memorial Church,
Andrews University

DWIGHT NELSON

Newsom, Carol A. *Daniel: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2014. liv + 416 pp. Hardback, \$50.00.

Carol Newsom teaches Old Testament at Candler School of Theology, Emory University. In 2011 she served as President of the Society of Biblical Literature. Her commentary on Daniel is a successor to the volume on Daniel by Norman Porteous in the Old Testament Library (OTL) series. Newsom’s work differs from the previous commentaries on Daniel because it includes extensive treatments of the history of reception of key topics from each chapter of Daniel since ancient times to the present. The history of reception was compiled by Brennan W. Breed from Columbia Theological Seminary. From this part of the commentary, for example, the reader can learn that the person of Daniel was used as a scriptural example by a group of South African theologians who produced “the Kairos Document, a theological rejection of the apartheid regime” (57). When tracing the history of reception of Daniel 8:14, Breed presents a long list of individual and group interpreters such as William Miller, Ellen White, the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the Jehovah’s Witnesses, the Baha’i, the Muslim Shi’ites, David Koresh, Harold Camping, and others (318).

Newsom believes that “the Daniel stories originated in the Eastern Diaspora in the late Neo-Babylonian and Persian periods” (21), but behind the compositions of the book she sees the hands of multiple authors. The author follows the thesis that the final date for Daniel’s book is the middle of the second century BC, though she admits that “We simply do not know what was going on in Jerusalem between mid-168 and mid-167” because “historical sources are so obscure and contradictory” (26). The situation is further complicated by the fact that “Persecution for religious reasons was basically unknown in Hellenistic culture” (27).

The stories from Daniel 1-6 show that God “is in control of history” and that He “delegates and eventually takes back sovereignty over the earth” (33). In contradistinction with divine sovereignty is the authority of the king whose food, so generously served at the palace, “represents power, both because of its source and because of the nature of the food itself” (50). While the power of the monarch is limited, the rule of the God of heaven is universal and eternal. Newsom states: “In identifying the God of Israel as the ‘God of heaven,’ the Persian highlight features that YHWH and the Persian god Ahura Mazda share in common, including a concern for cosmic order and